family-group name BUNGARIDAE Fitzinger, 1826 (as "Bungaroidea") is not to be given priority over ELAPIDAE Boie, 1827, and HYDROPHIIDAE Fitzinger, 1843, or either of them, whenever they are regarded as synonyms;

- (2) to add (1) (e): 'to rule that the family-group name URIECHINAE Cope, 1893, is not to be given priority over APARALLACTINAE Bourgeois, 1968 whenever the two are regarded as synonyms.'
- (3) to add to proposals (4) (a) and (b) 'given precedence under the plenary powers in (1) (d) above over BUNGARIDAE Fitzinger, 1826;'
- (4) to delete proposal (4) (d) and replace it by '(d) BUNGARIDAE Fitzinger, 1826 (type-genus Bungarus Daudin, 1803), ruled under the plenary powers in (1) (d) above not to have priority over ELAPIDAE Boie, 1827, and HYDROPHIIDAE Fitzinger, 1843, or either of them, when they are regarded as synonyms:'
- (5) to add to proposal (4): '(e) URIECHINAE Cope, 1893 (type genus Uriechis Peters, 1854), ruled under the plenary powers in (1) (e) above not to have priority over APARALLACTINAE Bourgeois, 1968, when the two are regarded as synonyms; (f) APARALLACTINAE Bourgeois, 1968 (type genus Aparallactus A. Smith, 1849), ruled under the plenary powers in (1) (e) above to have precedence over URIECHINAE Cope, 1893, whenever the two are regarded as synonyms.'
 - (6) to delete proposal (5).

These proposals regarding family-group names have consequences at generic and specific levels, as follows:

- (7) add to (2): '(g) Bungarus Daudin, 1803 (gender, masculine), type species, by subsequent monotypy (Stejneger, 1907, Bull. U.S. nat. Mus., vol. 58: 397) Bungarus annularis Daudin, 1803 (in Sonnini's Suites à Buffon (Paris, Defart), part 69, Hist. nat. gén. partic, Rept., vol. 5: 265 (= Pseudoboa fasciata Schneider, 1801); (h) Uriechis Peters, 1854 (gender, masculine), type species, by monotypy. Uriechis lunulatus Peters, 1854.
- (8) add to (3): '(g) fasciata Schneider, 1801, as published in the binomen Pseudoboa fasciata (Hist. Amph. vol. 2: 283) (valid specific name of type species of Bungarus Daudin, 1803); (h) lunulatus Peters, 1854, as published in the binomen Uriechis lunulatus (specific name of type species of Uriechis Peters, 1854).'

DICRANODONTA WOODS, 1899 (BIVALVIA, CUCULLAEIDAE): COMMENT ON REQUEST FOR DETERMINATION OF TYPE SPECIES:

Z.N.(S). 2227 (see vol. 35: 127-128)

By Simon R.A. Kelly (Department of Geology, Goldsmiths' College, New Cross, London, SE4 6NW) In paragraph 4 1 stated that the holotype was figured by Woods (1899) on plate 10, figure 14. This should have read pl. 10, figs. 11a-c. The specimen number is correct.

I hope that the correction of this point will let this application be accepted by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED DESIGNATION OF A TYPE SPECIES FOR GNATHODUS PANDER, 1856 (CONODONTA). Z.N.(S) 2279 see vol. 36: 57–62)

(1) By F.H.T. Rhodes (President, Cornell University, USA)

I am writing to support the proposal that the Commission should exercise its plenary powers to set aside all designations of type species hitherto made for the genus *Gnathodus* Pander, 1856, and designate *G. texanus* Roundy as the new type species of the genus.

The reasons that lead Dr Lane and Professor Ziegler to make this proposal are fully and lucidly set out in their paper. I wish to speak specifically to the need for nomenclatural and stratigraphic stability. This is especially important because much of our biostratigraphy in the Lower Carboniferous is based on species of *Gnathodus*. To ascribe all the specimens now placed in these species to another genus, of whatever name, would create taxonomic and stratigraphic confusion. Furthermore, nothing would be gained from this procedure, because the name *G. mosquensis*, in the absence of type material, must be treated as a nomen dubium.

The best way to retain the nomenclatural stability that has existed for over 120 years is to accept Lane & Ziegler's proposal, which I believe will receive widespread support from conodont workers.

(2) By Glen K. Merrill (College of Charleston, South Carolina 29401, USA)

Designation of a replacement type species for this genus under the plenary powers is long overdue. The original type species, G. mosquensis, is a nomen dubium according to nearly all specialists working with the group. Lane & Ziegler have accurately outlined the facts of the occurrence and fairly expressed consensus among specialists regarding the inadequacy of the existing situation.

Apart from the biostratigraphic problems that might result from the evaluation by Barskov et al., there is another argument for stabilising the generic concept of Gnathodus not mentioned by Lane & Ziegler. Many workers dealing with conodonts from Lower Carboniferous rocks now recognise that the longstanding concept of Gnathodus embraces more than a single generic group. Attempts to make meaningful distinctions have been frustrated, how-